

Mr. Wilbert Moore  
747 10th Ave. Apt. 35A  
New York, New York 10019  
(212) 246-6356 / billmoor@aol.com

November 21, 2017

Judge Lois Bloom  
EDNY  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, NY 11201

Dear Judge Bloom:

I'm alleging the following; pursuant to the U.S. Code's › Title 18 › Part I › Chapter 63 › § 1349, I filed a complaint with the Postal Inspector in which I'm alleging that Attorney Ingrid Gustafson at the NYC's Law Department committed mail fraud when she mailed me an allegedly fraudulent statement in her August 25, 2017, document (See "Exhibits 1 and 2"). The defendants falsely claimed that they were not representing Students A, B, C, and D, when in fact a January 9, 2007, "Notice of Appearance" that was signed and submitted by the NYC's Law Department's Attorney Andrez Carberry, clearly contradicts their alleged fraudulent statement of denial.

2. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure's (FRCP) Rule 26 demands the compliance with the initial duty to disclose. Initial disclosure in general demands that all parties must, without awaiting a discovery request, provide to the other parties: the names and, if known, the address and telephone numbers of each individual involved. My question is, why are so many judges and or conspirators allegedly in violation of the FRCP's Rule 26, and why are the Courts still refusing to compel discovery (See "Exhibit 3")?

3. I've proven to the Courts the fact that I won my AAA Arbitration and that the Arbitrator's Award removes the Courts jurisdiction, so why are the Courts so eager to acknowledge and follow the 2<sup>nd</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals (SCCA)'s Mandate when the very basis of one of my complaints involves the felonious misconduct of the alleged conspirators that issued the Mandate? I've made the Courts aware of the fact that they are issuing judgments and orders in favor of Students A, B, C, and D, yet to this very day the Courts cannot identify or even prove that the Students ever existed (See "Exhibit 3").

4. The conspirators at the SCCA would have you believe that their Mandate is valid when in fact in the caption of their Mandate they cannot name or prove the existence of the anonymous Students, therefore; they cannot enforce or attach jeopardy to their Mandate. I'm alleging that the SCCA's Mandates and the other Courts adverse rulings and orders that pertain to the anonymous defendants known as Students A, B, C, and D, are void because the conspirators cannot identify or prove the existence of the Students therefore jeopardy cannot be attached to them. Hypothetically; what's to prevent someone from filing an action against "Students Aye, Bee, Sea, and Dee" instead of "Students A, B, C, and D" how would the Court's attach jeopardy and without the proper identification, how would the courts distinguish the difference?

5. Who is really behind this alleged conspiracy that has lasted through two City Hall Administrations? What's at stake, are the conspirators and or the Courts afraid of being swamped by appeals after the revelation of the alleged fraudulent misconduct of some of its judges and clerks? Is this case an attempt to bust the unions? Is racism involved? For more information go on line and Google: moore v preska.

Wilbert Moore